

The Independent.

Vol. XVI.

LINCOLN, NEB., SEPTEMBER 1, 1904.

No. 15

The Progress of Populism

A Weekly News Letter from
National Headquarters by
Charles Q. DeFrance, Secretary.

Joliet, Ill., Aug. 27.—(Editorial Correspondence).—Moving the files and records of the Old Guard and the Vanguard of Populism from Lincoln, Neb., to this place and consolidating them with the records of Chairman Ferriss, is too much like the annual April "flitting" some urbanites indulge in—it gets things "all mixed." We are going ahead with a will and making a great deal of progress along certain lines, but each of us is still a long way from having his correspondence all cleaned up.

This has been a good week for putting up Watson and Tibbles electoral tickets—even Nevada, where the "silver party" seemed to be the "whole show," has fallen in line.

One of the pleasing events of the week was the Connecticut state convention. Theodore P. Rynder, one of the national committee for Pennsylvania, and editor of the Erie Echo, some days ago went down to the Nutmeg state and caused a wonderful rattling among the dry bones. I use that term advisedly, because that is substantially what our good friend, Robert Pyne, editor of the Hartford Examiner, said last spring in an editorial reply to my invitation for him to enroll in the Old Guard of Populism. Friend Rynder, it will be remembered, cast half the vote for Pennsylvania for Mr. Watson (the other delegate present being an admirer of Senator Allen) at Springfield, and was himself the most formidable opponent of Mr. Tibbles for the vice presidential nomination.

Wednesday Mr. Rynder telegraphed Chairman Ferriss as follows: "New Haven, Conn., Aug. 24.—James H. Ferriss, Joliet, Ill.—Straight populist electoral ticket put in the field today.—T. P. Rynder." Later by mail came marked copy of the New Haven Evening Leader, giving an excellent report of the convention as far as it had gone when that paper went to press. The news was given upper right hand corner of the first page, and the populists of Connecticut were treated right. "The people's party delegates," said the Leader, "though few in number, showed great enthusiasm when they filed into the meeting room. Some of them are hopeful that they will elect

a number of candidates, while others were more sanguine. None of them cared, however, to predict that they would elect the next president of the United States, but ventured the information that if the democratic nominee, Mr. Parker, is elected, the country will face a panic unprecedented in history."

The Leader claimed that a "slate" had been named as follows: For presidential electors: Robert Pyne, Hartford; Andrew Henry D. Shepherd, Branford; E. Bingham, Cheshire; T. L. Thomas, Bristol; George Hubbell, Ansonia; O. E. Wadhams, Torrington; and Andrew Leary, South Norwalk. These gentlemen were doubtless nominated for electors.

An executive committee was to be named as follows: W. W. Wheeler, Meriden; T. L. Thomas, Forestville; Austin B. Fuller, Orange; Frank Gleason, New Haven; and Edward Allen, Bristol.

No state ticket had then been agreed upon.

Great credit must be accorded Mr. Rynder and State Chairman Thomas for this successful outcome in a state that the national committee had about decided was too sterile ground to be worth the effort to work it.

Three state conventions will be held next Wednesday (31st)—Illinois, Indiana and Ohio. Tennessee comes the 8th.

A letter from National Committeeman Albion Gates, Carroll, Me., says that his fellow committeeman, Hon. L. W. Smith of Vinalhaven, is making arrangements to put a Watson and Tibbles electoral ticket upon the official ballot of Maine. Once upon a time, in the days of Uncle Solon Chase, there were greenbackers galore up in Maine—Chairman Ferriss tells a good story of his experience running a paper there—and if they could but be convinced that the people's party "has blood in its eye" this year, we might poll a surprising vote. Possibly it might be well to send Mr. Rynder up to help Mr. Smith.

The Mississippi state convention Thursday (25th) put up a Watson and Tibbles electoral ticket, headed by R. Brewer of Aubrey, Noxubee county;

and J. A. Bailey of Lauderdale county. Full report has not yet reached headquarters. With such solid men as Messrs. Brewer and Bailey heading the electoral ticket, the Watson and Tibbles vote ought to be large.

No attempt is made this week to give a systematic report. In a general way it may be said that electoral tickets are already up in Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Mississippi, Nevada, Connecticut and Texas; and within the next two weeks tickets will be nominated in practically all the states where a convention can be held. The work of securing signers to petitions is now going on in Maryland, West Virginia, New York and several other states. Possibly when the work is over it will be found that Delaware, Utah—and maybe Rhode Island—are the only states where the voter is deprived of his right to cast a vote for the gallant Watson and his gifted running mate, Tibbles.

Jaw W. Forrest, president of the Albany county democracy, which recently declared unanimously for Watson and Tibbles, writes that he held a conference at Rochester Thursday afternoon (26th) and comments: "Their coats are off and we will get a big vote there." Also that a meeting was held at Buffalo Friday night. "They are on fire here," says Mr. Forrest. He expected to address a meeting at Jamestown Saturday night. The people's party electoral and state ticket will probably be ready to announce Monday. To get on the official ballot will require petitions accompanied by affidavits of something like 100 voters in each county, who swear that they intend to vote for the ticket to be thus nominated. To secure these affidavits requires much hard work and considerable expense—but with Mr. Forrest leading there is little doubt about the outcome.

The Colorado populists did the right thing at their state convention Friday (26th) in nominating Judge Frank W. Owers of Leadville for governor, Ellen G. Cassidy of the Ridgway populist for regent of the state university, and H. H. Northcott for congressman at large. The remainder of the ticket is doubtless equally deserving; but those named are better known to the populists of the United States. Judge Owers was a prominent participant in

the Denver conference last year, being one of the committee that drafted the celebrated "Denver manifesto," which declared that henceforth the people's party should be committed to independent national political action; and his fearless attitude as judge of the district court, in those troublous times when some Colorado judges are cowardly enough to hold court with armed troops in the room menacing them, has endeared him to those who love a brave and just man. Mr. Northcott was a delegate present at Springfield, taking a prominent part—and has had experience running for congress, having been the candidate of the people's party two years ago. And Mrs. Cassidy edits one of the three remaining populist papers of Colorado—those which weathered the gale and whose editors kept the faith.

Jamestown, N. Y., democrats seem to be in a state of revolt against Parker and Parkerism. Earl Stratton, R. F. D. 75 (think how Tom Watson's rural free delivery has been developed there) writes that "there is a serious revolt of Bryan men in this (Chautauque) county, and it would be advisable to induce these men to vote for Watson and Tibbles." Among the more prominent Bryan men who are up in arms against the Parkerization of their party, Mr. Stratton names M. George Martyn and Eaton L. Moses of Jamestown and Frank H. Root of Busti.

But the revolt is not confined to Chautauque county. Down in Dave Hill's balliwick—where Forrest and Mahoney have about cleaned the platter with the Albany county democracy—lives W. H. Frazier, senior member of W. H. Frazier & Son, manufacturers of printed wrapping paper and paper novelties. Mr. Frazier, writing to Mr. Tibbles for a copy of the Springfield platform, says: "I desire to cast my ballot for American principles, the greatest good for the greatest number, being a follower of Peter Cooper, Gen. Weaver, and W. J. Bryan, all of whom I admire—but I can not vote for Judge Parker and be true to my principles and teachings of more than sixty years." Mr. Frazier will not be disfranchised this year; he can vote "under the Liberty Bell" for Watson and Tibbles and the people's party state ticket.

C. Q. DE FRANCE.

HON. HENRY M. McDONALD

Radical Democratic Candidate for Governor
of New York in 1898
out for WATSON and TIBBLES

Among the many prominent men in New York who have recently announced their intention to support Watson and Tibbles is Mr. Henry M. McDonald of 63-65 Wall street. He attended the Cooper Union meeting and the reception afterward, held at Union Square hotel. In a private letter to the editor he says: "I am greatly interested in promoting the candidacy of Mr. Watson and yourself. We are rapidly organizing the people's party in the different counties of the state. We have selected a county committee of forty-two members in this county. . . . It has been suggested that I accept the nomination for congress in this district. I will do so unless some other man is found who would attract a greater number of votes to the ticket. A populist candidate in this district can not expect to be elected, but may reasonably hope to poll from 1,000 to 2,000 votes."

The entrance into the party and the open advocacy of populist principles by Mr. McDonald and many other men of like high standing and noble character in New York city and in the upper counties of the state, who desire as they say "to leave a country for their children," makes the populist movement a tremendous force in that and all adjoining states.

In an interview recently published Mr. McDonald says:

"Mr. Parker's speech of acceptance, of the presidential nomination, consists of two parts. The first, and much the longer, is a dissertation upon the theory and functions of a republican form of government. This

section of his address, while interesting as an exposition of the views of the early presidents, is not particularly pertinent to the leading issues of the campaign. The remainder of his speech is made up of scanty and scattering statements more or less remotely bearing upon a few of the declarations of principles adopted by the St. Louis convention. This declaration, Mr. Parker denominates "an admirable platform," and forthwith proceeds to emasculate it of its clear and positive statements. The St. Louis platform, after pronouncing for the "enforcement of laws, giving labor and capital impartially their just rights," "the trial by jury in the case of indirect contempt" and "against the use of the military in the summary punishment of citizens without trial or for the control of elections" declares that "we are in favor of the arbitration of differences between corporate employers and their employes, and favor the strict enforcement of eight-hour day law on all public work." Mr. Parker, on the other hand, in the only statements which he makes respecting the labor question, after effusively declaiming about "dynamite outrages," "deportation of citizens without trial,"—matters appertaining solely to the administration of affairs in the state of Colorado and entirely outside the jurisdiction of the national government—grandiloquently declares that the "essence of good government lies in strict observance of constitutional limitations, enforcement of law and order and rugged opposition to all encroachment upon the sovereignty of

the people." These sentiments of Mr. Parker, which are very fine, meet with the approval of all decent citizens irrespective of party. Noticeably, however, Mr. Parker is entirely silent upon the straight from the shoulder declaration of the St. Louis platform demanding the enactment of remedial statutes designed to meet the present unsatisfactory labor situation. Evidently, these declarations are too strong meat for the candidate.

"The democratic platform favors a 'revision and gradual reduction of the tariff by the friends of the masses and for the common weal.' The contest for this revision is to begin at once, and is to be fought to a finish. Mr. Parker, however, says that 'it should be frankly conceded that though our party be successful in the coming contest, we can not hope to secure a majority in the senate during the next four years, and hence shall be unable to secure any modification in the tariff, save that to which the republican senate man consent.' Are these the words of a brave man, fervently interested in the reform of atrocious revenue laws? Is this declaration of advance surrender calculated to encourage a minority in congress to contest until, as has been the case more than once in the history of this country, such minority shall by sheer force of logic and pluck overcome an irresolute majority occupying an untenable position. No! Such a declaration by Mr. Parker stifles the positive statements of the St. Louis platform respecting tariff reform.

The democratic platform demands

"a strict enforcement of existing civil and criminal statutes against such (those infringing the laws) trusts, combinations and monopolies, and the enactment of such further legislation as may be necessary to suppress it." Mr. Parker, however, asserts "that the common law as developed affords a complete legal remedy against monopoly." Will the learned ex-judge tell us what remedy the common law gives a non-stockholder against a monopolistic corporation? Is it not incredible that our congresses and legislatures should have deemed it absolutely necessary to enact remedial statutes against trusts, combinations and monopolies, if the common law is sufficient to prevent and to punish infractions of statutory law giving these corporations the right to exist? Would these corporations have so strenuously and bitterly resisted the enactment of these statutes, had the common law been sufficient to reach their infractions of statutory law? No! This declaration of Mr. Parker is an attempt to side-track the demands of the St. Louis platform respecting trusts, as was that of the New York platform to the effect that trusts and monopolies should be amenable alone to state—not to national laws.

"The St. Louis platform insists that we ought to do for the Filipinos what we have already done for the Cubans," and continues "it is our duty to make that promise now, and upon suitable guarantees of protection to citizens of our own and other countries resident there at the time of our withdrawal, set the Filipino people